



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

de pierre, which, by the way, contains many of the peculiarities indicated by Siede as belonging to the popular speech of the present day); but before consonants all after *a* may be thrown off: j'sais pas d'quel état qu'a sont(qu'elles sont). *Leur* appears as *leux* and *lui* as *li*. Two datives, one the so-called ethical dative, are of frequent occurrence: Qu'est-ce qu'elle te *lui* a fait? (cf. L'Assommoir, p. 126: Dis donc, tu n'es pas embarrassée, tu *vous* lâches ça; and p. 442, Ah bein! merci, tu *vous* pompes joliment ça). A strange anomaly is the confounding of *je* and *nous*, to be explained undoubtedly by the common confusion of the corresponding forms of the verb: j'sommes trois Français; et vous voulez-t'y point que je nous trouvions malheureux (que je me trouve, etc.); j'ons évu l'malheur d'perdre nos (mes) deux femmes. The disjunctive pronoun at times takes the place of the conjunctive: *moi* vas appeler maman. (cf. the negro patois of Louisiana: *mo* va pas prêté vous bâton pou cassé mo latête; and of Mauritius: *Li* fine vendé son coçon—il a vendu son cochon). It is a mistake however to say this is confined to children. *Leur* and *lui* appear as reflexives: C'est leurs femmes qui vont *leur* amuser (s'amuser); C'étoient pas lui non plus qui *lui* plaigniont. On p. 26 Siede takes exception to the derivation of the abbreviated feminine demonstrative from *cette*, because it is "lautlich unmöglich, dass der Tonvokal zu Gunsten des unbetonten ausgefallen sein sollte. Vielmehr haben wir es hier mit einem der Volkssprache eigentümlichen Demonstrativum *ste* zu thun." I see no reason for this; because I have observed that where *cette* is properly tonic, it is usually not abbreviated: *cette* affaire est arrivée (pr. sèt afe'rètarivé); but dans c'te affaire, à c'te heure (pr. danstafèr, asteur), where *cette* is thrown back upon the preposition, forming one word with it and thereby losing its tonicity. Very peculiar is the use of the article with the demonstrative: c'est lui qu'a donné les *ceux* [ces oiseaux] qu'a madame.

The major part of the remainder of the thesis is given to the verb. Mention has already been made above of the confounding of certain forms with others: *j'avons* and the shortened *était*: *j'ons* for j'ai. Very abnormal is *équiont* for *étaient*: c'équiont d'la fine tarre qui n'y aviont point sa meilleure. The following show peculiarities that will explain themselves: depuis cinq heures

qu'ils se sont levés avec sa femme [i. e. lui et sa femme, referring back to *ils*] il n'avait rien pris; c'est moi qui s'trompe; c'est vous qui va être heureuse; j'm'attends à être aboyée; y faut qu'a save tout (il faut qu'elle sache tout); c'est le petit au menuisier qui m'a tombé; je t'en moque; je m'importe peu que tu tombes; elle a venue à Paris; dans tous les services que je suis été; il s'a ensauvé; vous ne vous a point gêné. The *passé défini* and the *imp. subj.* have almost wholly disappeared from the speech of the people, the *passé indéfini* and the *pres. subj.* having taken their places. Even amongst the educated it is considered pedantic to use the *imp. subj.* too frequently.

There are many other interesting features in Siede's dissertation, which must be passed by unnoticed. His first thesis on the back-cover: Es ist nicht wahrscheinlich, dass die franz. Volkssprache in syntaktischer Hinsicht einen bedeutenden Einfluss auf die Sprache der Gebildeten üben wird, is so much of a truism, that it needed no discussion. No language whose grammar has been once firmly fixed, is ever affected syntactically by the popular speech, as long as a moderately fair standard of culture is kept up by its people. The influence from this source will be only lexical.

SAMUEL GARNER.

Indiana University.

*On the Formation of the Plural in s in English.* By PROF. H. TALLICHET, University of Texas.

In Bulletin No. 2, of the University of Texas, Prof. Tallichet attacks the opinion enunciated by Latham, Marsh and others that "English was influenced by Norman-French, not only in its vocabulary, but also in its grammar." "He (Marsh) ascribes," says Prof. Tallichet, "to Norman influence: the periphrastic comparison of the adjective, the periphrastic genitive, the use of the preposition before the infinitive, and the formation of the plural of nouns in *s*. (*Lectures on the English Language*, p. 384)." The paper before us considers the last assertion only, promising an early investigation of the others. The author sets out with a truth which it would be well for all to bear in mind when tracing the influence which one language exerts upon the grammatical development of

another. I quote the entire passage: "But, is it not evident, on the other hand, that the grammatical influence of one cognate language upon another is of so delicate a nature that a student of language cannot be too guarded in his conclusions, and that nothing but the most incontrovertible *scientific* proof can warrant him in making assertions like the above? The only proof offered in this case is the mere existence of parallel forms in the two languages, and this cannot be considered satisfactory, for parallel forms have been found in languages, that could not, by any possible chance, have ever come in contact with one another; how much more frequently, then, are we not expected to meet them in languages of the same family that have undergone, side by side, the transformation from the synthetical to the analytical stage." The proof adduced by Prof. T. to disprove this statement is conclusive. Not only the *a*-declension, as the advocates of French influence admit, forms its plural by the addition of *s*, but "all the masculine proper nouns declining strong, the greater number of nouns in *nd* from present participles—*freondas* and *feondas*, by the side of *frynd* and *fynd*,—nearly all the masculine nouns of foreign origin introduced and naturalized in Anglo-Saxon before the conquest: *abbod*, etc. Also the masculines in *i* and *u* frequently present similar forms. In other declension we have *falderas*, and even feminines, e. g. *sae-s* and *ae-s*." The consideration of the plural formation in Anglo-Saxon shows that plurals in *s* are the rule in the Teutonic branch whereas it is the exception in the Latin group (?). French influence must have first manifested itself in the vocabulary, but this is contrary to fact, as shown by Madden in his edition of Layamon. Even here the plural in *es* has encroached upon that of *en*, *e* (13th cent.). The French of the 14th century, however, presents the following scheme. Nom. sing. in *s*, acc. sing. in —, nomi. pl. in —, acc. pl. in *s*. But in *Josaphaz*, *set Dormanz* and *Petit Plet* by Chardry, an Anglo-Norman trouvreur of the 13th cent. "*s* as sign of the nom. sing. is found but seldom, the plural is generally formed with the suffix *s*." Hence the author concludes that the influence may have been exactly the opposite. Whatever may have been the influence of the French

upon the substantives, it had none whatever upon adjectives. The results telling for the rejection of French influence are summed up as follows: (1) "Of the two branches of the Indo-European family the Teutonic had best preserved the *s* ending in the plural, while in the Italic the *s* had generally disappeared. (2) A large number of nouns in Anglo-Saxon and a majority of foreign naturalized nouns already formed their plural in *s* before the conquest. (3) At the beginning of the 13th century, when the vocabulary had not yet shown any marks of French influence, *s* was already the almost universal plural ending for nouns. (4) *s* did not become a plural ending in the Continental French dialects until the middle of the 14th century. (5) The adjective shows no sign of French influence. (6) Final *s* is generally silent in French, while it is generally sounded in English."

I venture to say that no scholar of the present day will doubt that the formation of the plural in English by the addition of *s* is the legitimate development of that tendency of declension early shown in all the Teutonic languages, nay it began even in Sanscrit, and is a well-known factor even in Greek and Latin, to pass from the other declensions (the *i*-, *u*- and cons.) to the *a*-declension. Latham died before the exact science of grammar had brought all these facts to light. Marsh was the first pioneer in America in the scientific study of grammar, and as such deserves the greatest praise; but even his most ardent admirers will not claim for him that thorough scientific knowledge which the later investigations have alone made possible. Those who have accepted their results merely, without original investigation of their own, detract rather than add to the authority of their masters. We must turn for confirmation or rejection of this theory to those who have made the matter subject of special investigation. Koch in his *Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache* does not once mention French influence in tracing the historical development of the Anglo-Saxon declensions through the Semi-Saxon, the Old and Middle English periods to the modern period where *s* has become the almost exclusive plural sign. Yet the whole inference of his logic is that this result was inevitable, even without the aid of foreign influence, though

the confusion caused by the Norman Conquest must have hastened it. The same may be said of Mätzner in his *Englische Grammatik*. In speaking of the genitive, however, (and the two cases are in most respects parallel), Mätzner says: "The sign of the genitive singular *s* originally belongs to the singular of masculine and neuter forms of the strong substantives. In English it was early transferred to all substantives in the singular, also to feminines. In this the English agrees with the Danish and Swedish, the former of which has nearly unified the declension of masculine and feminine nouns" (cf. Mätzner *Eng. Gram.* I, 254). The silence of these scholars in regard to a matter of so great importance is a strong proof that they did not consider it necessary to resort to outside influence to explain what in itself was a legitimate result of the tendency of the language, especially observed in Anglo-Saxon, a tendency at work as far back as history carries us. I fear the idea of French influence originated on English (and American) soil and has found its only advocates there; it reminds us very much of the development of the genitive singular from the possessive pronoun *his*. And yet England has produced the most outspoken defender of the legitimate development of plurals in *s*. Oliphant in his *Old and Middle English* seems to have made it a matter of conscience to antagonize the idea of French influence wherever possible. In commenting on the Lindisfarne Gospels (950 A.D.) he says: "The genitive singular and nominative plural in *es* swallowed up the other forms. Thus we came back to the Aryan pattern in all but plurals like *oxen*. There is a wrong notion abroad that the German plural in *en* is more venerable than the English plural in *es*." (cf. examples *ibid.* 106). Again, p. 119 (1119 A.D.): "We should cast aside all the old notions about our grammar owing its debasement to the Norman Conquest. Rich Kent, though overrun with foreigners, held fast to the Old English endings down to 1340, long after the greater part of the land had dropped them; Yorkshire had got rid of many of her endings long before the Normans came. It was not these last conquerors that substituted the plural ending *es* for the old plural in *en*; this *en* with its genitive in *ene*, lasted until 1340 in Kent." Further on, p. 346: "Some say that

the French ending in *es* had great influence in making England adopt *es* for the plural ending of all her nouns; so far is this from the truth, that in the present piece the poet goes out of his way to alter the French *freres* into *freren*, the old plural form to which Southern England steadily clung."

Even a casual glance at Siever's *Paradigmen zur Deutschen Grammatik* will be sufficient to convince one that all the declensions of the German languages are fast assimilating themselves to the *a*-declension. If we remember, moreover, that not only the masc. *a*-stems, but also the masc. *i*-stems (they had already passed in the plural to the *a*-decl.) and the masc. cons. stems (like *faeder*, *feōnd*, *freōnd*) formed their plural in *as*, we cannot but conclude that the analogy of these Anglo-Saxon words would be far more powerful than French influence, especially when we add that the French itself was only in the transition stage from its older declension to the modern. If the truth be told, I believe that English exerted more influence upon the French plural in *s* than *vice versa*.

S. PRIMER.

College of Charleston.

*Kinder und Hausmärchen der Gebrüder Grimm*, selected and edited with English notes, glossary and a grammatical appendix, by W. H. VAN DER SMISSEN, M. A., lecturer on German in University College, Toronto. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1885. pp. text 65, total 190, 75c.

This book is intended as a first reader and a drill-book in grammatical forms and constructions, and its editor is confident that "the charming simplicity of diction and thought in these tales renders them peculiarly fit for beginners in the German language to read."

It surely is a prime requisite, but by no means a simple task to select such prose as will arouse the interest of the student and command his respect for the language he is studying. But whatever charm *Märchen* may have for very young children and for mature minds, youth usually finds in them little to enjoy and much to ridicule.

Moreover, one who has had experience in teaching German prose-composition knows